

REMARKS

Claims 3 and 4 are in the case. Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,751,473 to Goyal et al. in view of JP-08294030 to Manabu et al. By this Response, applicant has replaced claims 1 and 2 with new claims 3 and 4. Reconsideration of the subject application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under §103 over Goyal and Manabu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Manabu discloses a straight type of cellular phone. Considering the current trend toward a small size, light weight cellular phone, a straight type of cellular phone is extremely unstable when put on, e.g., a table upright and, moreover, low in sensitivity when laid flat because an antenna and a ground surface become parallel to each other. For this reason, a straight type of cellular phone is not expected to be used in a hands-free position at all. Further, one skilled in the art will not be motivated to design the casing of such a straight type of cellular phone with the concept of hands-free use.

The claimed invention relates to a foldable cellular phone, free from the problems of a straight type of cellular phone stated above. More specifically, even when consideration is given to the trend toward a small size, light weight configuration, a foldable cellular phone can be put on, e.g., a table in an unfolded hands-free position and maintains high sensitivity with an antenna thereof being positioned upright relative to a ground surface. Thus, the foldable cellular phone of the present invention is designed to realize hands-free use. Stated another way, no one would be motivated to implement a hands -free TV phone with the straight type of cellular phone of the reference. In this sense, the present invention, realizing a hands-free TV phone with a cellular phone, is not limited to a range that one skilled in the art can estimate. It follows that it is difficult to reach the crux of the present invention by simply applying

the reference, which pertains to a straight type of cellular phone, to a foldable cellular phone.

Therefore, the present invention required by new claims 3 and 4 is not obvious over the cited prior art. Accordingly, the subject rejection is believed to be overcome.

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in immediate condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 19, 2005

By Hua Gao (40,414)
Hua Gao Reg. No. 40,414
Michael J. Scheer Reg. No. 34,425
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant